

MORE ON THE CUT AND CHOOSE GAME

JINDŘICH ZAPLETAL

The Pennsylvania State University

ABSTRACT. We improve on the results of [Vel] and give some examples.

In [Jech], a number of infinite games on (complete) Boolean algebras were defined. Among them was the following Prikry-style “cut and choose” game $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$:

I	p, b_0	b_1		b_i		$i < \omega$
II	r_0	r_1		r_i		

where p, b_i 's are elements of the Boolean algebra B in question and $r_i \in 2$ for $i < \omega$. II wins a run of the game $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$ if $p \wedge \bigwedge_{i < \omega, r_i=1} b_i - \bigvee_{i < \omega, r_i=0} b_i \neq 0$. Intuitively,

I chooses an element $p \in B$ under which the game is to take place and then asks questions like “is b_i an element of the generic ultrafilter?” II must give an answer. II wins if in the end the choices he has made are compatible with p . For this game to be interesting it is necessary that B be complete and we shall assume so for all Boolean algebras considered in the rest of the paper. [Jech] gives the following:

Fact 1. *I has a winning strategy in $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$ if and only if B adds real numbers.*

Problem 1. *Is it true in ZFC that II has a winning strategy in $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$ does not imply that B has a σ -closed dense subset?*

Problem 2. *Find in ZFC a Boolean algebra B such that $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$ is undetermined.*

In this paper, we give a solution to the Problem 2 and an approximation to a solution of Problem 1, best possible modulo the solution of the apparently difficult open Problem 6 of [Jech]. (This has been done in [Vel] by different methods.) Further we consider relationship between $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$ and some stronger distributivity properties of B .

Let us fix a Boolean algebra B . A strategy for II in $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$ is a function $\sigma : B \times B^{<\omega} \rightarrow 2^{<\omega}$ such that if $\langle p, t \rangle \in \text{dom}(\sigma)$, $\text{lth}(t) = i$ implies $\text{lth}(\sigma(\langle p, t \rangle)) = i$ and for each $j < i$, $\sigma(\langle p, t \restriction j \rangle) = \sigma(\langle p, t \rangle) \restriction j$. A strategy σ is winning if for all $\langle p, t \rangle \in B \times B^\omega$, $p \wedge \bigwedge_{\sigma(\langle p, t \restriction i+1 \rangle)(i)=1} t(i) - \bigvee_{\sigma(\langle p, t \restriction i+1 \rangle)(i)=0} t(i) \neq 0$.

There are two canonical examples of Boolean algebras in which II has a winning strategy in $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$: namely, any σ -closed forcing and Prikry forcing with a normal

measure U [Pří]. (See Example 3 for a completely different poset.) We can paraphrase the Problem 1 as “Find an analog of Prikry forcing in ZFC.” Our results are as follows:

Theorem 1. *If II has a winning strategy in $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$, then B is semiproper.*

Theorem 2. *If II has a winning strategy in $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$, and B has $(2^\omega)^+$ -c.c. then II has a winning strategy in the descending chain game $\mathcal{G}$.*

Theorem 3. *($0^\#$ does not exist) If II has a winning strategy in $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$, then II has a winning strategy in the descending chain game $\mathcal{G}$.*

The descending chain game $\mathcal{G}$ is to be defined shortly. An improvement of the Theorem 3 appears in [Vel].

Theorem 4. *Cons(κ supercompact) implies Cons(in any $\aleph_1$ -distributive algebra II has a winning strategy for $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$).*

We also show that the latter statement has a consistency strength of at least that of $o(\kappa) = \kappa^{++}$.

Proof of the Theorem 1. Let σ be a winning strategy for II in $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$ associated with a Boolean algebra B .

Definition. *If $\dot{r}$ is a B -name for a real, $j < \omega$, $\langle p, t \rangle \in B \times B^{\leq \omega}$, we say that $\langle p, t \rangle$ decides $\dot{r}(j)$ if for some $i < \text{lth}(t)$ $t(i) = [\dot{r}(j) = 1]$. If this is the case then we set $\langle p, t \rangle(\dot{r}(j)) = 1$ if $\sigma(\langle p, t \rangle)(i) = 1$ and 0 otherwise.*

Fix a sequence $\langle r_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle$ of distinct reals (elements of 2^ω) which does not contain a perfect subset. Let $\dot{\alpha}$ be a B -name for a countable ordinal.

Claim 1. *For each $\langle p, t \rangle \in B \times B^{< \omega}$ there is $\langle p, s \rangle \in B \times B^{< \omega}$ such that $t \subset s$ and for each $j < \omega$, $s_0, s_1 \in B^{< \omega}$ if $s \subset s_0, s_1$, $\langle p, s_0 \rangle, \langle p, s_1 \rangle$ both decide $r_{\dot{\alpha}}(j)$ then $\langle p, s_0 \rangle(r_{\dot{\alpha}}(j)) = \langle p, s_1 \rangle(r_{\dot{\alpha}}(j))$.*

Proof of the Claim. By contradiction. (!# \$?) Assume there is $\langle p, t \rangle$ witnessing the failure of the statement. By induction on $\text{lth}(\eta)$, $\eta \in 2^{< \omega}$ we build $s_\eta \in B^{< \omega}$ so that

- (1) $s_\emptyset = t$, $\eta_0 \subset \eta_1$ implies $s_{\eta_0} \subset s_{\eta_1}$
- (2) for all $\eta \in 2^{< \omega}$ there is j , $\text{lth}(\eta) < j < \omega$ such that both $\langle p, s_{\eta \smallfrown 0} \rangle, \langle p, s_{\eta \smallfrown 1} \rangle$ decide all the $r_{\dot{\alpha}}(i)$, $i \leq j$ and they decide $r_{\dot{\alpha}}(j)$ differently.

There is no problem in the induction. Once we are done, for $x \in 2^\omega$ we set $r_x : \omega \rightarrow 2$, $r_x(i) = \langle p, \bigcup_{\eta \subset x} s_\eta \rangle(r_{\dot{\alpha}}(i))$. Since σ is a winning strategy,

$$q = p \wedge \bigwedge_{\eta \subset x, \sigma(\langle p, s_\eta \rangle)(i)=1} s_\eta(i) - \bigvee_{\eta \subset x, \sigma(\langle p, s_\eta \rangle)(i)=0} s_\eta(i) \neq 0$$

(q witnesses the success of σ against $p, \bigcup_{\eta \text{ subset } x} s_\eta$.) Now obviously $q \Vdash r_{\dot{\alpha}} = r_x$. So all the r_x , $x \in 2^\omega$ are on the sequence $\langle r_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle$. However, the construction of s_η 's gives that $\{r_x : x \in 2^\omega\}$ is a perfect set of reals, contradicting our assumption on $\langle r_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle$.

Fix $N \prec H_\theta$ countable, with $B, \sigma, \langle r_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle \in N$, and choose $p \in N \cap B$. Let $\langle \dot{\alpha}_i : i < \omega \rangle$ be the list of all B -names for countable ordinals in N . Let $\omega = \bigcup_{j < \omega} Z_j$ be a disjoint union of infinite sets. We build $\langle t_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ by induction on n so that

- (1) $t_n \in B^{< \omega} \cap N$, $t_n \subset t_{n+1}$, $t_n \subset t_{n+1}$ implies $t_n \subset t_{n+1}$

- (2) if n is the first element of some Z_j then let $t_{n+1} \in B^{<\omega} \cap N$ be some finite sequence witnessing the Claim 1 for $\dot{\alpha}_j$, $\langle p, t_n \rangle$ in N such that $\langle p, t_{n+1} \rangle$ decides $r_{\dot{\alpha}_j}(0)$
- (3) if n is i -th element of some Z_j , $i > 1$, then $t_{n+1} = t_n \frown [r_{\dot{\alpha}_j}(i-1) = 1]$.

Let $t = \bigcup_{n < \omega} t_n$. Then

$$q = p \wedge \bigwedge_{\sigma(\langle p, t \restriction i+1 \rangle)=1} t(i) - \bigvee_{\sigma(\langle p, t \restriction i+1 \rangle)=0} t(i) \neq 0$$

since q witnesses the success of σ against p, t . We claim that $q \Vdash N[G] \cap \omega_1 = N \cap \omega_1$, finishing the proof of the Theorem 1. For let $\dot{\alpha}_j \in N$ be a name for a countable ordinal. Let n be the first element of Z_j . Define $r : \omega \rightarrow 2$ by $r(i) = k$ if $\forall s \in B^{<\omega}$ if $t_{n+1} \subset s$ and $\langle p, s \rangle$ decides $r_{\dot{\alpha}_j}(i)$ then $\langle p, s \rangle(r_{\dot{\alpha}_j}(i)) = k$. The choice of t_{n+1} makes sure that r is welldefined. Now all the parameters used in the definition of r are in N , so r itself is in N . Moreover, $q \Vdash r_{\dot{\alpha}_j} = r$ and so $q \Vdash \dot{\alpha}_j < N \cap \omega_1$. We are done.

This solves the Problem 2. For example shooting a closed unbounded set through a stationary costationary subset of ω_1 [BHK] does not add countable sequences of ordinals, but it is not semiproper and so there is no winning strategy for II in $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$. In the end of the paper we give a more sophisticated example of a proper $\aleph_0$ -distributive algebra with no winning strategy for II in $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$ (in ZFC).

Definition. Given a complete Boolean algebra B , the descending chain game $\mathcal{G}$ is defined as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ll} I & b_0 \quad b_1 \quad \dots \quad b_i \quad \dots \quad i < \omega \\ II & c_0 \quad c_1 \quad \dots \quad c_i \quad \dots \end{array}$$

where b_i, c_i 's are elements of B and $b_0 \geq c_0 \geq b_1 \geq c_1 \geq \dots$. II wins a run of $\mathcal{G}$ if $\bigwedge_{i < \omega} b_i \neq 0$.

[Jech] has a proof that any B for which II has a winning strategy in $\mathcal{G}$ regularly embeds into an algebra with σ -closed dense subset. However, the question whether B itself contains necessarily such a subset remains open.

Fact 2. ([Vel]) For any B , II has a winning strategy in $\mathcal{G}$ if and only if II has a winning strategy in the following game $\mathcal{G}_1$:

$$\begin{array}{ll} I & p, A_0 \quad A_1 \quad \dots \quad A_i \quad \dots \quad i < \omega \\ II & a_0 \quad a_1 \quad \dots \quad a_i \quad \dots \end{array}$$

where p, a_i 's are elements of B , $A_i \subset B$ are maximal antichains and $a_i \in A_i$. II wins a run of $\mathcal{G}_1$ if $p \wedge \bigwedge_{i < \omega} a_i \neq 0$.

(To pacify the reader, we state explicitly here that this is the last game introduced in this paper.)

Proof of the Theorem 2. We follow closely the proof of the Theorem 1. Fix B, σ such that B has $(2^\omega)^+$ -c.c. and σ is a winning strategy for II in $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$ associated with B . Due to the Fact 2, it is enough to find a winning strategy for II in $\mathcal{G}_1$. II proceeds as follows: at the m -th move he will have $p \in B$, $A_i \subset B$, $i < m$ representing

the moves of I, $a_i : i < m$, II's answers and $\langle r_a^i : i < m, a \in A_i \rangle$, reals $r_i, i < m$ and $s_i \in B^{<\omega}, i \leq m$ so that

- (1) $i < j \leq m$ implies $s_i \subset s_j$
- (2) $\langle r_a^i : a \in A_i \rangle$ is a sequence of distinct reals which does not contain a perfect set, for all $i < m$.
- (3) For $i < m$, if $\dot{a}_i$ is the B -name for the unique element of A_i in the generic ultrafilter, then the real r_i is such that for all $j < \omega$, $s \in B^{<\omega}$, if $s_{i+1} \subset s$, $\langle p, s \rangle$ decides $r_{\dot{a}_i}(j)$ then $\langle p, s \rangle(r_{\dot{a}_i}(j)) = r_i(j)$. We have $r_i = r_{\dot{a}_i}^i$.
- (4) $\langle p, s_m \rangle$ decides all $r_{\dot{a}_i}$, $i < m$ up to m .

It is not difficult to proceed in the construction. Choose a sequence $\langle r_a^m : a \in A_m \rangle$ of distinct reals which does not contain a perfect subset. Here we use the chain condition of B . Similarly as in the claim 1, we find an extension s_{m+1} of s_m and a real r_m such that (3) continues to hold at m . We can obviously require that $\langle p, s_{m+1} \rangle$ decides all $r_{\dot{a}_i}$ up to $m+1$, $i \leq m$. II plays the unique a_m such that $r_{a_m}^m = r_i$. This is a winning strategy since in the end,

$$p \wedge \bigwedge_{i < \omega} a_i \geq p \wedge \bigwedge_{m < \omega, \sigma(\langle p, s_m \rangle)(i)=1} s_m(i) - \bigvee_{m < \omega, \sigma(\langle p, s_m \rangle)(i)=0} s_m(i) \neq 0$$

the element of B on the right hand side of the inequality witnessing the success of σ against $p, \bigcup_m s_m$. (Notice it decides all $r_{\dot{a}_i}$ to be equal to r_i and so the $\dot{a}_i$'s to be equal to a_i 's.)

Example 1. *Theorem 2 is optimal; $\text{Cons}(\kappa \text{ measurable})$ implies $\text{Cons}(\text{there is } B \text{ of density } \aleph_2 \text{ where II wins } \mathcal{G}_{c\&c} \text{ but does not win } \mathcal{G})$.*

Let κ be measurable, $G \subset \text{Coll}(\omega_1, < \kappa)$ generic. We work in $V[G]$. There is a variation of Namba forcing in which II wins $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$ (see proof of the Theorem 4). We will need the following: there is C , a complete algebra in which II wins $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$ and there is a C -name $\dot{f}$, $C \Vdash \dot{f} : \omega \rightarrow \omega_2^{V[G]} = \kappa$ is increasing and cofinal". Now fix $S \subset \{\alpha < \omega_2 : \text{cof}(\alpha) = \omega\}$ such that both S , $\{\alpha < \omega_2 : \text{cof}(\alpha) = \omega\} \setminus S$ are stationary in ω_2 and let $P = \{a \in [S]^{\aleph_0} : a \text{ closed}\}$ ordered by endextension. $B = RO(P)$. II does not win $\mathcal{G}$ here since B is not proper. We describe a winning strategy for II in $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$. Fix $\leq$, a wellordering of P and σ , a winning strategy for II in $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$ associated with C . At m -th step of our game we will have $p, b_0, \dots, b_m \in B$, I's questions, $r_0, \dots, r_{m-1} \in 2$, II's answers and C -names $\dot{a}_0, \dots, \dot{a}_{m-1}$ so that

- (1) $\forall i < m$ $C \Vdash \dot{a}_i$ is $\leq$ least extension of $\dot{a}_{i-1}$ (or $\check{p}$ if $i = 0$) deciding b_i (that is, either under b_i or incompatible with b_i) with $\text{sup}(\dot{a}_i) > \dot{f}(i)$
- (2) in the game $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$ associated with C , if I asks $1, [\dot{a}_i < b_i]$, $i < m$, then at i -th position σ answers just r_i .

It is trivial for II to proceed in the construction. We want to show that in the end, II wins. So let $p, b_0, b_1, \dots, b_i, \dots, i < \omega$, be members of B . Find $N \prec H_\theta$ countable such that $\leq, p, B, C, \sigma, \langle b_i, i < \omega \rangle \in N$ and $\text{sup}(N \cap \omega_2) \in S$. Find a N -generic filter $H \subset N \cap C$ such that $q \in H$, where q witnesses the success of σ against $1, [\dot{a}_i < b_i]$ $i < \omega$. Let $a = \bigcup_{i < \omega} \dot{a}_i / H \cup \{\text{sup}(N \cap \omega_2)\}$. It is left to the reader to show that $a \in P$ and that a decides all the b_i 's as required.

Proof of the Theorem 3. As in the Theorem 2, we show that a winning strategy for II in $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$ gives a winning strategy in $\mathcal{G}_1$ and by Fact 2 we finish. Thus let σ be a winning strategy for II in $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$ associated with a Boolean algebra B . We describe

how II wins $\mathcal{G}_1$. After m -th move of I in that game we will have $p \in B, A_i : i \leq m$, representing the moves of I, $a_i : i < m$, the answers II has given so far and an auxiliary sequence $s_m \in B^{<\omega}$ such that

- (1) $s_0 = \langle \rangle, m_0 < m_1 \leq m$ implies $s_{m_0} \subset s_{m_1}$
- (2) for $i < m$ there is $j < \text{lth}(s_{i+1})$ such that a_i is $s_{i+1}(j)$ and $\sigma(\langle p, s_{i+1} \rangle)(j) = 1$.

We show how to obtain $s_{m+1}, a_m \in A_m$ so that (1),(2) continue to hold. Then II's m -th move in $\mathcal{G}_1$ will be a_m . If we succeed in doing that for all $m < \omega$, II wins the run of $\mathcal{G}_1$ since

$$p \wedge \bigwedge_{i < \omega} a_i \geq p \wedge \bigwedge_{m < \omega, \sigma(\langle p, s_m \rangle)(i)=1} s_m(i) - \bigvee_{m < \omega, \sigma(\langle p, s_m \rangle)(i)=0} s_m(i) \neq 0$$

since the element of B standing on the right witnesses the success of σ against $p, \bigcup_{m < \omega} s_m$.

To get the m -th move, II simulates a run of $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$ as follows: let θ be large regular, $\leq$ a wellordering of H_θ . Choose $N \prec \langle H_\theta, \in, \leq \rangle$ such that $s_m, A_m, p, B \in N$, $|N| = \aleph_0$ and there is no countable submodel M of $\langle H_\theta, \in, \leq \rangle$ with $N \subset M$, $B \cap (M \setminus N) \neq \emptyset$ and $M \cap \omega_1 = N \cap \omega_1$. The existence of such a model is guaranteed by $\neg 0^\#$. Let $\{b_i : i < \omega\} = N \cap A_m$. Now we proceed as in the proof of the Theorem 1 to get a N -semimaster condition $q < p$ with two changes: $t_0 = s_m$ and we require that b_i sits on the sequence t_{i+1} . We claim that $\exists i < \omega \exists j < \text{lth}(t_{i+1}) b_i = t_{i+1}(j)$ and $\sigma(\langle p, t_{i+1} \rangle)(j) = 1$. (*Proof.* Otherwise $q < p$, the condition witnessing success of σ against $p, \bigcup_{i < \omega} t_i$ forces “ $N[G] \cap \omega_1 = N \cap \omega_1, A_m \cap N \cap G = \emptyset$ ”. Find $a \in A_m$ compatible with q . $a \notin N$ and a standard argument gives that if M is the Skolem hull of $N \cup \{a\}$ in $\langle H_\theta, \in, \leq \rangle$ using the canonical Skolem function generated by $\leq$, then $M \cap \omega_1 = N \cap \omega_1$. This would contradict maximality of N .) So fix i as above, set $s_{m+1} = t_{i+1}$ and let II play $a_m = b_i$. The induction hypotheses continue to hold and we are done.

Obviously, the method of proof of the Theorem 3 falls short of reaching measurable cardinals. If we try to find a counterexample to its statement in Dodd's K , the most natural thing to do is to look at projections of P in K , where U is a normal measure and $P \in L[U]$ is the Prikry forcing. This will not work, though.

Claim 2. *Let U be a normal measure at κ , P the associated Prikry forcing. There are no nontrivial regular subalgebras Q of $RO(P)$ with $Q \Vdash \text{“}\kappa \text{ is regular”}$.*

Corollary. *In $L[U]$: if $j : V \rightarrow M$ is the ultrapower by U , then there are no regular subalgebras of the Prikry forcing in M and so in K .*

Remark. In the presence of large cardinals it can happen that there is a regular subalgebra of a Prikry forcing in the associated ultrapower. Also, see Example 4 for a poset in K with a winning strategy for II in $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$ in $L[U]$.

Question 1. *Is it consistent to have κ regular and a cardinal-preserving Q of size κ such that Q singularizes κ ?*

In the view of the claim a negative answer to this question would prove that the Prikry forcing has no regular subalgebras of density κ .

Question 2. *Can the assumption of the Theorem 3 be weakened to “ $L[U]$ does not exist”? (Yes. [Vel])*

Proof of the Corollary. Work in $L[U]$. Let us assume that $Q \in M$ is an isomorphic copy of a dense subset of a regular subalgebra of the Prikry forcing. Then in V , $Q \Vdash \text{“}\kappa \text{ is regular”}$. If this were not the case then due to the κ^+ -c.c. of Q in V (and so in M) the name witnessing that $Q \Vdash \text{cof}(\kappa) = \omega$ would be in M . So $M \models \text{“}Q \text{ has } \kappa^+\text{-c.c., does not collapse cardinals less than } \kappa \text{ and it singularizes } \kappa\text{”}$. So we have a failure of covering lemma in M^Q [DJ]. Therefore $Q \Vdash \text{“}\kappa \text{ is regular”}$ and by the Claim 2 Q is trivial.

Proof of the Claim 2. Let us assume that we have Q as in the Claim. First we prove that Q does not add subsets of κ and then argue that there are no κ -centered non-trivial forcings which do not add subsets of κ . Since Q , being a regular subalgebra of κ -centered $RO(P)$, is itself κ -centered, this will finish the proof.

Thus assume that $Q \Vdash \text{“}\dot{A} \in \mathcal{P}(\kappa) \setminus V\text{”}$. $\dot{A}$ is a P -name and we build $A_t, t \in \kappa^{<\omega}$ so that $\alpha \in A_t$ iff $\alpha \geq \max(t)$ and there is $C \in U, \langle t, C \rangle \Vdash_P \alpha \in \dot{A}$. A standard argument yields $D \in U$ with $\langle 0, D \rangle \Vdash_P \text{“if } \kappa_0, \kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_i, \dots \text{ is the Prikry sequence then } \dot{A} \cap [\kappa_i, \kappa_{i+1}) = A_{\langle \kappa_0, \dots, \kappa_i \rangle} \cap [\kappa_i, \kappa_{i+1})\text{”}$. Choose $G \subset Q$ generic such that $\text{proj}_Q \langle 0, D \rangle \in G$. Set $A = \dot{A}/G$. Build $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_i, \dots, i < \omega$ in $V[G]$ by induction so that $\lambda_{i+1} = \sup\{\alpha < \kappa : \exists t \in \lambda_i^i \alpha = \min\{\beta < \kappa : A \cap [\max(t), \beta) \neq A_t \cap [\max(t), \beta)\}\}$. (Notice that since $A \notin V$, for any $t \in \kappa^{<\omega}$ there is α as in the definition of λ_{i+1} .) Now it is easy to see that if $H \subset P, \langle 0, D \rangle \in H, G \subset H$, is generic then the Prikry sequence has to be dominated by λ_i ’s. However, κ was regular in $V[G]$ and so $\sup_i \lambda_i < \kappa$, a contradiction proving the Claim.

Proof of the Theorem 4. Let κ be supercompact, $G \subset \text{Coll}(\omega_1, < \kappa)$ generic. We claim that in $V[G]$ all $\aleph_1$ -distributive algebras have winning strategies for II in $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$. Work in $V[G]$. Let us assume that B is $\aleph_1$ -distributive, $\lambda = |\mathcal{P}(B)|$. In V , pick a normal measure $U \subset \mathcal{PP}_{<\kappa}\lambda$. U generates a filter $\hat{U} \subset \mathcal{PP}_{\aleph_1}\lambda$ in $V[G]$. It is possible to prove that $\mathcal{PP}_{\aleph_1}\lambda/I$, where I is the ideal dual to $\hat{U}$, has a σ -closed dense subset D (see [Lav]).

Let $P = \{T \subset (\mathcal{P}_{\aleph_1}\lambda)^{<\omega} : T \text{ is a tree, } T \text{ has a trunk } t \text{ and for } s \in T, t \subset s \text{ implies } \{a \in \mathcal{P}_{\aleph_1}\lambda : s \cap \langle a \rangle \in T\} \notin I\}$, ordered by inclusion. P is a certain variation of Namba forcing. Now, B regularly embeds into $RO(P)$: assume $H \subset P$ is generic. H yields a sequence $\langle a_i : i < \omega \rangle \subset (\mathcal{P}_{\aleph_1}\lambda)^{V[G]}$ such that $\lambda = \bigcup_{i < \omega} a_i$. If $\langle D_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ is some enumeration in $V[G]$ of dense open subsets of B , one can find a sequence $p_0 > p_1 > \dots > p_i > \dots, i < \omega$ of elements of B such that $p_i \in \bigcap_{\alpha \in a_i} D_\alpha$, which is open dense by distributivity of B . Consequently, the filter on B generated by the p_i ’s will be generic over $V[G]$.

To complete the proof, it is enough to show that II has a winning strategy in $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$ associated with $RO(P)$, since this property is obviously inherited by all of its subalgebras. We describe the strategy. At m -th step of the game we will have $T \in P, b_i, i \leq m$ in $RO(P)$, the moves I made and an auxiliary sequence $T_i, i \leq m$ such that

- (1) $T = T_0 > T_1 > \dots > T_m$ are trees with the same trunk T ,
- (2) T_{i+1} decides the statement “ $b_i \in H$ ”, H generic, $i < m$
- (3) $\forall i \leq m \forall s \in T_i t \subset s \text{ implies } \{a \in \mathcal{P}_{\aleph_1}\lambda : s \cap \langle a \rangle \in T_i\} \in D$.

The construction of T_{m+1} follows closely the proof of Prikry property in Prikry forcing. It answers 1 if $T_m \Vdash b_m \in H$, otherwise the answer is 0. In the end, let

$T_\omega = \bigcap_{i < \omega} T_i$. By tree induction on elements of T_ω one can check that $T_\omega \in P$ is a tree with trunk t . σ -closure of D is used here. T_ω witnesses that II wins the run of $\mathcal{G}_{c \& c}$ in question. The Theorem follows.

Example 2. $(\neg \exists \kappa \ o(\kappa) = \kappa^{++})$ A $\aleph_1$ -distributive algebra for which II does not have a winning strategy in $\mathcal{G}_{c \& c}$.

Let κ be the ω_1 -st strong limit cardinal. Our hypothesis gives (see [Git,Sch]) that $2^\kappa = \kappa^+$, $\kappa^\omega = \kappa$, $\square(\kappa^+)$. Choose $E \subset \text{cof}(\omega) \cap \kappa^+$ stationary, nonreflecting. The cardinal arithmetic implies $\diamond(E)$. Fix $\langle S_\alpha : \alpha \in E \rangle$ so that $S_\alpha : \alpha^{<\omega} \rightarrow 2^{<\omega}$ and for each $S : (\kappa^+)^{<\omega} \rightarrow 2^{<\omega}$ there is $\alpha \in E$ such that $S \upharpoonright \alpha^{<\omega} = S_\alpha$. Fix $\langle c_\alpha : \alpha \in E \rangle$ such that $c_\alpha \subset \alpha$ is cofinal of ordertype ω with an increasing enumeration $\gamma_0^\alpha, \gamma_1^\alpha, \dots$. Define $\langle b_\alpha : \alpha \in E \rangle$ by $b_\alpha = \{\gamma_i^\alpha \in c_\alpha : S_\alpha(\langle \gamma_0^\alpha, \gamma_1^\alpha, \dots, \gamma_i^\alpha \rangle)(i) = 1\}$. Finally we define our partial ordering $P = \{a \subset \kappa^+ : |a| \leq \kappa, \forall \alpha \in E \cap \sup(a) + 1 \mid (a \cap c_\alpha) \Delta b_\alpha = \emptyset\}$. Order by endextension.

Claim 3. $\forall a \in P \ \forall \alpha < \kappa^+ \ \exists b < a \ \sup(b) \geq \alpha$.

Proof. Assume for contradiction that a, α witness the failure of the claim with $\alpha < \kappa^+$ smallest possible.

- (1) α is a successor. The contradiction is immediate.
- (2) $\alpha \in E$. $\text{cof}(\alpha) = \omega$ and one can build $a = a_0 > a_1 > \dots > a_i > \dots, i < \omega$ so that $\sup(\bigcup_{i < \omega} a_i) = \alpha$. Now we change $\bigcup_{i < \omega} a_i$ on $c_\alpha \setminus \sup(a)$ to get b so as to satisfy $|b \Delta b_\alpha| = \aleph_0$. Since the ordertype of c_α is ω , the similar statement at $\beta < \alpha$ will persist through this change. The amended set will therefore be a condition in P endextending a with supremum α .
- (3) $\alpha \notin E$, $\text{cof}(\alpha) = \omega$. Build $a = a_0 > a_1 > \dots > a_i > \dots, i < \omega$ so that $\sup(\bigcup_{i < \omega} a_i) = \alpha$. $\bigcup_{i < \omega} a_i \in P$, it endextends a and its supremum is α .
- (4) $\text{cof}(\alpha) > \omega$. Choose $C \subset \alpha$, $C \cap E = \emptyset$. Build $a = a_0 > a_1 > \dots > a_i > \dots$ so that j limit implies $\sup(\bigcup_{i < j} a_i) \in C$. Then $\bigcup_i a_i \in P$, it endextends a and its supremum is α .

In all cases, a contradiction. The Claim is proven.

So $P \Vdash \text{"}\bigcup G \subset \kappa^+ \text{ is cofinal"}\text{"}$. Let me prove that P is $\aleph_1$ -distributive. Let $\langle D_i : i < \omega_1 \rangle$ be a sequence of open dense subsets of P , $a \in P$. Choose $M \prec H_\theta$, θ large, $\kappa, P, a, \langle D_i : i < \omega_1 \rangle \in M$, $|M| = \kappa$, $M^\omega \subset M$, $M \cap \kappa^+ = \alpha$ of cofinality ω_1 . Choose $C \subset \alpha$ closed unbounded of ordertype ω_1 disjoint from E . Much like in the case (4) in the proof of the Claim, we can construct a sequence of conditions $a > a_0 > a_1 > \dots > a_i > \dots, i < \omega_1$ such that each $a_i \in D_i \cap M$, for $i < \omega_1$ limit $\sup(\bigcup_{j < i} a_j) \in C$. Then $\bigcup_{i < \omega_1} a_i \in \bigcap_{i < \omega_1} D_i$ and is less than a , finishing the proof of distributivity. Now let σ be a strategy for II in $\mathcal{G}_{c \& c}$ associated with $RO(P)$. Consider $S : (\kappa^+)^{<\omega} \rightarrow 2^{<\omega}$, the restriction of σ to questions like $p = 1$, $[\alpha \in \bigcup G]$, $\alpha < \kappa^+$. Fix $\alpha \in E$ such that $S_\alpha = S \upharpoonright \alpha^{<\omega}$. Then if I puts $p = 1$ and $b_i = [\gamma_i^\alpha \in \bigcup G]$, then σ must fail, because due to the construction of P , no $a \in P$ with $\sup(a) > \alpha$ (and there is a dense set of those by the Claim 3) will agree with the choices σ has made in the run of $\mathcal{G}_{c \& c}$.

Example 3. (ZFC) A proper $\aleph_0$ -distributive algebra for which II does not have a winning strategy in $\mathcal{G}_{c \& c}$.

Let $\mathcal{T} = \{T : T \text{ is a tree on countable ordinals such that if } \text{height}(T) = \beta \text{ then } \forall \alpha < \beta \ \forall \gamma < \alpha \ \exists \text{ } \gamma \text{ compatible with } \alpha \text{ at the } \alpha\text{-th level of } T\}$. For $T \in \mathcal{T}$

$\beta < \omega_1$ we define $T \restriction \beta = \{x \in T : \exists \gamma < \beta \text{ } x \text{ is at level } \gamma \text{ of } T\}$. We view $T \restriction \beta$ as a tree with its ordering inherited from T . Choose $f : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ such that $\text{height}(f(T)) = \text{height}(T) + 1$ and $T = f(T) \restriction \text{height}(T)$. Finally we define a partial order $P = Q_0 * \dot{Q}_1$. Choose $S \subset \omega_1$ stationary costationary and set $Q_0 = \{T \in \mathcal{T} : \forall \beta \in S \cap \text{height}(T) \text{ } T \restriction \beta + 1 = f(T \restriction \beta)\}$ with ordering $T_0 < T_1$ if $T_1 = T_0 \restriction \text{height}(T_1)$. Q_0 is σ -closed. Let $Q_0 \Vdash \dot{Q}_1 = \bigcup G$ with the obvious ordering". A standard argument gives that $Q_0 \Vdash \bigcup G$ is a Souslin tree" and so P is $\aleph_0$ -distributive proper, since it is an iteration of two such forcings. P has a dense subset of size 2^ω , namely $\{\langle T, x \rangle : T \in Q_0, x \in T\}$. In view of the Theorem 2, to show that II has no winning strategy for $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$ associated with $RO(P)$, it is enough to show that there is no such strategy for $\mathcal{G}$. Let σ be a strategy for II in $\mathcal{G}$. W.l.o.g. the moves for II are from the abovedescribed dense subset of P . Choose $N \prec H_\theta$ countable with $f, B, P, \sigma \in N$, $\beta = N \cap \omega_1 \in S$ and $D_i : i < \omega$ an enumeration of open dense subsets of Q_0 in N . Let $\langle \eta_i : i < \omega \rangle$ be an enumeration of $2^{<\omega}$ respecting the extension ordering of η_i 's. In N we construct partial plays $W_i : i < \omega$ of $\mathcal{G}$ by induction so that

- (1) η_i extends η_j implies W_i extends W_j , W_i 's are played according to σ
- (2) $\text{lth}(W_i) = \text{lth}(\eta_i)$ and the last move in W_i is played by II
- (3) $i < j$ implies that if $\langle T_i, x_i \rangle$ is the last move played in W_i and $\langle T_j, x_j \rangle$ is the last move played in W_j then $T_j < T_i$
- (4) if η_i and η_j are extension-incompatible and $i < j$ then x_i, x_j are incompatible in T_j
- (5) $T_i \in D_i$.

There is no problem in the induction. Once we are done, set $T = \bigcup T_i$. If $x_{\eta_i} \in T$ is in the last move played by II in W_i then the construction above makes sure that $\langle x_\eta : \eta \in 2^{<\omega} \rangle$ form a perfect subtree of T . So one of its branches does not have a lower bound in $f(T)$, which has only countably elements on β -th level. The game played along this branch witnesses the failure of σ . (Notice that $f(T)$ is a "mandatory" extension of T since $\text{height}(T) = \beta$ and $\beta \in S$.)

Example 4. (κ measurable) A proper algebra B of density κ where II wins $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$ but II does not win $\mathcal{G}$.

Let $S \subset \{\alpha < \kappa : \text{cof}(\alpha) = \omega\}$ be such that both $S, \{\alpha < \kappa : \text{cof}(\alpha) = \omega\} \setminus S$ are stationary in κ . Let $\mathcal{T}, f$ be as in Example 3. We define the forcing $P = Q_0 * \dot{Q}_1$ as follows: $Q_0 = \{\langle g, T \rangle : g : \alpha \rightarrow \kappa \text{ for some } \alpha < \omega_1 \text{ is increasing continuous and } T \in \mathcal{T} \text{ has height } \alpha \text{ and for all } \beta < \alpha, \text{ if } g(\beta) \in S \text{ then } T \restriction \beta + 1 = f(T \restriction \beta)\}$. Order by coordinatewise extension. Q_0 is σ -closed and $Q_0 \Vdash \dot{R} = \bigcup \{T \in \mathcal{T} : T \text{ appears in a condition in the generic ultrafilter}\}$ is a Souslin tree". (*Proof.* Let $p \in Q_0$ force " $\dot{A} \subset \dot{R}$ is a maximal antichain". Choose $N \prec H_\theta$ countable with $S, p, \dot{A} \in N$ and $\sup(N \cap \kappa) \notin S$. Build a N -generic sequence $p > \langle g_0, T_0 \rangle > \dots > \langle g_i, T_i \rangle > \dots, i < \omega$. Then $C = \{x \in \bigcup_i T_i : \exists i < \omega \langle g_i, T_i \rangle \Vdash \check{x} \in \dot{A}\}$ is a maximal antichain in $\bigcup_i T_i$. Set $g = \bigcup_i g_i \cup \{N \cap \kappa\}$ and find an extension T of $\bigcup_i T_i$ of height $N \cap \omega_1 + 1$ such that C is still a maximal antichain in T . Then $p > \langle g, T \rangle \Vdash \dot{A} = \check{C}$, in particular it is countable".) Let $Q_0 \Vdash \dot{Q}_1$ is $\dot{R}$ with the obvious ordering". Let $B = RO(P)$. B is proper and II has no winning strategy in $\mathcal{G}$, as one can show with a variation of the argument in Example 3. B has a dense subset $D = \{\langle g, T, x \rangle : \langle g, T \rangle \in Q_0, \text{dom}(f) = \alpha + 1 \text{ for some } \alpha < \omega_1 \text{ and } x \in T \text{ is on the } \alpha\text{-th level of } T\}$. (For $p \in D$, $p = \langle g, T, x \rangle$ we call $\alpha = \text{max}(\text{dom}(g))$ maximum of p .) So B has density κ . To show

that II has a winning strategy in $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$, proceed as follows: choose $\triangleleft$, a wellordering of D and U , a measure on κ . At the m -th stage of the game we will have $p, b_0 \dots, b_m$, I's moves, $r_0, \dots, r_{m-1}$, II's answers and an auxiliary sequence $A_i : i < m$ such that

- (1) $A_{m-1} \subset \dots \subset A_1 \subset A_0$ are all members of U
- (2) $\forall i < m \forall \alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_i \in A_i$ if $p > p_0 > p_1 > \dots > p_i$ is such that for $j \leq i$ p_j is $\triangleleft$ -least extension of p_{j-1} (or of p if $j = 0$) deciding b_j with maximum of $p_j \geq \alpha_j$ then $p_j \Vdash b_j \in G$ if $r_j = 1$ and $p_j \Vdash b_j \notin G$ if $r_j = 0$.

It is easy to proceed in the construction. Define a partition $h : A_{m-1}^{m+1} \rightarrow 2$ (or $h : \kappa \rightarrow 2$ if $m = 0$) by $h(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_m) = 1$ just in case when if $p > p_0 > p_1 > \dots > p_m$ is such that for $j \leq m$ p_j is $\triangleleft$ -least extension of p_{j-1} (or of p if $j = 0$) deciding b_j with maximum of $p_j \geq \alpha_j$ then $a_m \Vdash b_m \in G$. (α_j are in increasing order.) There is $A \subset A_{m-1}$ in U homogeneous for h . Let $A_m = A$ and r_m the homogeneous value.

Let us have an arbitrary run of $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$ according to the above strategy. We want to see that II wins. Let $A = \bigcap_{i < \omega} A_i \in U$. Choose $N \prec H_\theta$ such that $p, b_i, i < \omega, A, S, \triangleleft \in N, N \cap \kappa \notin S, \text{cof}(N \cap \kappa) = \omega$. Then one can find a sequence $\alpha_i : i < \omega \subset A \cap N$ increasing and cofinal in $N \cap \kappa$. We construct $p > p_0 > p_1 > \dots, p_i, \dots, i < \omega$ so that $\forall i < \omega$ p_i is the $\triangleleft$ -least extension of p_{i-1} (or of p , if $i = 0$) deciding b_i with maximum of $p_i \geq \alpha_i$. Then since $N \cap \kappa \notin S$ one can find a condition extending all p_i 's and therefore witnessing the success of II.

The complexity of the previous example was due to our effort to make B proper. The method shows that for example shooting a club subset through S as above with countable approximations gives a Boolean algebra where II wins $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$.

Question 3. *The game $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$ was defined to have length ω . Are versions of it with different countable lengths equivalent in terms of existence of winning strategies?*

In view of the Theorem 3 one needs at least $0^\#$ for answering this question negatively. Example 4 could be relevant here, as the method used to generate a winning strategy in $\mathcal{G}_{c\&c}$ gives no hint how to proceed in longer games. Without further specifications on κ and S it could happen, however, that there would be winning strategies even for longer games. For that, go to the Gitik's models [Zap1] for Rudin-Keisler increasing sequence of κ -complete ultrafilters at κ of length $\alpha < \omega_1$ and use similar trick as in the Example 1, only with forcing $\mathcal{Q}_\kappa$ instead of Namba forcing.

REFERENCES

- [BHK] J. Baumgartner, L. Harrington, E. Kleinberg, *Adding a closed unbounded set*, Jour. Symb. Logic **41** (1976), 481–482.
- [DJ] A. J. Dodd, R. B. Jensen, *The covering lemma for $L[U]$* , Ann. Math. Logic **22** (1982), 127–135.
- [Dodd] A. J. Dodd, *The core model*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes in Mathematics no. 61, Cambridge, 1982.
- [Git] M. Gitik, *The strength of the failure of SCH*, Jour. Pure Appl. Logic **51** (1991), 215–240.
- [Jech] T. J. Jech, *More game-theoretic properties of Boolean algebras*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **26** (1984), 11–29.
- [Kan] A. Kanamori, *Higher infinite* (to appear).
- [Kun] K. Kunen, *Set theory, an introduction to independence proofs*, Amsterdam, 1980.
- [Lav] R. Laver.
- [Pří] K. L. Příkrý, *Changing measurable into accessible cardinals*, Dissertationes Mathematicae **68** (1970), 5–52.
- [Sch] F. Schlicht, *Cardinal invariants in the constructible model $\mathcal{P}_{\aleph_1}$* , Ph.D. thesis, UCLA, 1999.

- [She] S. Shelah, *Proper forcing*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics no. 940, Berlin, 1982.
- [Vel] B. Veličković, *Playful Boolean algebras*, Transactions of AMS **296** (1986), 727–740.
- [Zapl] J. Zapletal, *Gitik's forcing: an exposition*.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY, UNIVERSITY PARK,
PA 16802

E-mail address: zapletal@math. psu. edu